UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,286	01/26/2004	Alphonse Garcia	253055US0CONT	9903

22850 7590 03/19/2010

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
CORDERO GARCIA, MARCELA M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1654	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/19/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/763,286	GARCIA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARCELA M. CORDERO GARCIA	1654	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 December 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *4,7,12-16,20-25,27 and 29-40* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 17-18, 28* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *19 and 26* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/28/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, drawn to a polypeptide less than 30 amino acids in size, preferably less than 20 amino acids, characterized in that in vitro, it specifically binds a type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits, in the reply filed on December 29, 2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that the claims of Groups I-VIII are integrally linked as compounds (composition) method of making and method of use and that restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independent or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the Examiner if restriction is not required (MPEP 803). Applicant submits that a search of all the claims would not impose a serious burden on the Office. As the Office has not show any evidence that a restriction should now be made when the EPO did not, restriction is believed to be improper. Also applicant indicates that all the sequences disclosed in the specification have been examined and found free of prior art by the Examination Division of the EPO.

2. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but not deemed persuasive for the reasons of record as set forth in pages 2-7 of the Office Action dated October 16, 2009 and for the following reasons: Please note that this application is a continuation of PCT/FR02/02705. Thus this is not a national stage application. The inventions as claimed are drawn to a peptide, a polynucleotide, a purified antibody, use of a peptide for preparing a drug for treating a viral or parasitic infection, use of a peptide for preparing a drug that may induce apoptosis of target cells, use of a

polynucleotide in the in vitro diagnosis of parasitic or viral disease, method of identifying a peptide specifically binding a type 2A protein and method of preparing a peptide. The restriction is proper based on 35 USC 121 and 806.05(j). The search burden is set forth in pages 4-5 of the previous Office Action. Furthermore, Applicant is entitled to rejoinder if the product is found allowable (see MPEP 821.04(b) and pages 8-9 of the previous Office Action). With regards to the arguments that the EPO did not find any prior art, this is not relevant per se to the US examination as a separate search is conducted and the standards for novelty and anticipation are not identical.

The restriction requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Applicant's election with traverse of the species RHSRIGIIQQRRTRNG (SEQ ID NO: 2) in the reply filed on December 29, 2009 is also acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that all the sequences disclosed in the specification have been examined and found free of prior art by the Examination Division of the EPO. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but not deemed persuasive for the reasons of record as set forth in pages 2-7 of the Office Action dated October 16, 2009 and for the following reasons: The instant peptides are drawn to distinct sequences that require different searches as they have distinct molecular/chemical compositions. Furthermore, with regards to the arguments that the EPO did not find any prior art, this is not relevant per se to the US examination as a separate search is conducted and the standards for novelty and anticipation are not identical.

The election of species requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Status of the claims

4. Claims 1-40 are pending in the application. Upon searching the elected species, other species encompassed by the instant claims were found and are herein examined for the sake of compact prosecution. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 17-19, 26 and 28 are deemed to read upon the examined species and are presented for examination on the merits. Claims 4, 7, 12-16, 20-25, 27, 29-40 are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 19 and 26 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because they are in the multiple dependent claim and are dependent on another multiple dependent claim (i.e., claim 11). See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 19 and 26 have not been further treated on the merits. All claims dependent upon objected claims are also objected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by.Jacotot et al. (US 7,056,735).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Jacotot et al. disclose peptides less than 30 amino acids in size derived from Vpr protein of the HIV virus such as, e.g., the peptide characterized by the sequence HFRIGCRHSRIG (Vpr71-82) [see also cols. 14-15] which interacts directly with ANT to trigger the permeabilization of mitochondrial membranes, as well as apoptosis and killing cancer cells (e.g., cols. 8 and 21 and claims). The peptides are known to have apoptotic activity as set forth in the claims of US '261 (e.g., claims 101-102) and include HFRIGCRHSRIG (SEQ ID NO: 225 of US '261, HFKIGCKHSKIG (SEQ ID NO: 226 of US '261), HFRIGCRHSRIGIIQQRRTRNGASKS (SEQ ID NO: 227 of US '261) HFKIGCKHSKIGIIQQRRTRNGASKS (SEQ ID NO:228 of US '261) (e.g., see claim 85 of Jacotot et al.).

Please note that with respect to the limitations "characterized in that in vitro, it specifically binds a type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits" and the limitation "characterized in that it competitively inhibits interaction of the native protein from which it is derived with a PP2a holoenzyme or one of its subunits" are not

expressly taught, however, the peptides above meet the structural limitations required by the claims and therefore such binding activity would be inherent to the peptide of Jacotot et al. which encompass a Vpr fragment having 30 aminoacids or less in size. Furthermore, "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. [...]Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. [...]There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. (See MPEP 2112). With respect to the art rejection above, please note that the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether Applicants' binding activity to type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits or competitive inhibition interaction of the native protein form derived from PP2A holoenzyme (within the claimed composition) differ and, if so, to what extent, from that of the discussed reference. Therefore, with the showing of the reference, the burden of establishing non-anticipation by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Therefore the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by.Edelman et al. (US 2003/0077826).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Edelman et al. disclose peptides less than 30 amino acids in size derived from Vpr protein of the HIV virus characterized in that they are included in one of the following sequences, e.g.,: b) RHSRIGIIQQRRTRNG (SEQ ID NO: 2). See, e.g., Table I, p. 4, Vpr 71-96 and Vpr 71-96[R73,77,80K].

Please note that peptides comprising a) VEALIRILQQLLFIHFRI (SEQ ID NO: 1). See, e.g., Table I, p. 4, Vpr 52-82 and Vpr52-82[R73,77,80K] but comprise 31 amino acids.

Edelman et al. teach that C-terminal peptides of Vpr containing the conserved sequence HFRIGCRHSRIG can cause permeabilization of CD4T lymphocytes, a dramatic reduction of mitochondrial membrane potential and finally cell death (e.g., p.5). Please note that with respect to the limitations "characterized in that in vitro, it specifically binds a type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits" and the limitation "characterized in that it competitively inhibits interaction of the native protein from which it is derived with a PP2a holoenzyme or one of its subunits" are not expressly taught, however, the peptides above meet the structural limitations required by the claims and therefore such binding activity would be inherent to the peptides of

Edelman et al. which encompass Vpr fragments having 30 aminoacids or less in size. Furthermore, "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. [...]Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. [...]There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. (See MPEP 2112). With respect to the art rejection above, please note that the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether Applicants' binding activity to type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits (within the claimed composition) differs and, if so, to what extent, from that of the discussed reference. Therefore, with the showing of the reference, the burden of establishing non-anticipation by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Therefore the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

9. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 17, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Macreadie et al. (PNAS, 1995).

Macreadie et al. disclose peptides less than 30 amino acids and preferably less than 20 amino acids in size derived from Vpr protein of the HIV virus characterized in that they are included in one of the following sequences, e.g.,: Figure 5, which include

RHSRIGVTRQRRARNG (SEQ ID NO: 40) See, e.g., Figure 5, line 3. The peptides have apoptotic properties (e.g., abstract).

Please note that with respect to the limitations "characterized in that in vitro, it specifically binds a type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits" and the limitation "characterized in that it competitively inhibits interaction of the native protein from which it is derived with a PP2a holoenzyme or one of its subunits" or "apoptosis of tumor cells" are not expressly taught, however, the peptides above meet the structural limitations required by the claims and therefore such binding activity would be inherent to the peptides of Macreadie et al. which encompass Vpr fragments having 30 aminoacids or less in size. Furthermore, "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. [...]Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. [...]There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. (See MPEP 2112). With respect to the art rejection above, please note that the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether Applicants' binding activity to type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits, competitive inhibition or apoptotic properties with tumor cells (within the claimed composition) differ and, if so, to what extent, from that of the discussed reference. Therefore, with the

showing of the reference, the burden of establishing non-anticipation by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Therefore the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

10. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moreno et al. (J Biol Chem, February 2000, cited in the IDS dated).

Moreno et al. teach a peptide less than 30 amino acids in size derived from, e.g., striatin (STR277, EDRDTKEALKEFDFLVT corresponding to striatin amino acids 277-294) characterized in that in vitro, it specifically binds a type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits (e.g., ps. 5257-5259, including Figure 2). Moreno et al. teach peptides that form stable complexes with the PP2A A/C heterodimer and may represent a novel family of PP2A B-type subunits (e.g., abstract, pages 5262-5263). With respect to the limitations drawn to "competitively inhibits interaction of the native protein from which it is derived with a PP2a holoenzyme or one of its subunits " and "apoptosis of tumor cells", although not expressly taught, however, the peptides above meet the structural limitations required by the claims and therefore such binding activity would be inherent to the peptides of Moreno et al. which encompass striatin fragments having 30 aminoacids or less in size. Furthermore, "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. [...]Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. [...]There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have

recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. (See MPEP 2112). With respect to the art rejection above, please note that the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether Applicants' competitive inhibitory interaction or apoptotic properties (within the claimed composition) differ and, if so, to what extent, from that of the discussed reference. Therefore, with the showing of the reference, the burden of establishing non-anticipation by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Therefore the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

11. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 17, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arunagiri et al. (Apoptosis, 1997).

Arunagiri et al. disclose peptides less than 30 amino acids and preferably less than 20 amino acids in size derived from Vpr protein of the HIV virus characterized in that they are included in one of the following sequences, e.g.,: Peptides 1-6 as described in page 70: VTRQRRARNGASRS, CRHSRIGVTRQRRARNGASRS, HFRIGCRHSRIGVTQQRRARNGASRS, HFRIGCRHSRIG, AIIRILQQLLFIHFRIGCRHSRIGVTRQ. Please note that AIIRILQQLLFIHFRIGCRHSRIGVTRQ reads upon a peptide characterized in that it includes a sequence that is distinguished from SEQ ID NO: 1 by deletion of amino acids V and E. The peptides are involved in apoptosis (e.g., abstract and pages 69-74.

Please note that with respect to the limitations "characterized in that in vitro, it specifically binds a type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits" and

the limitation "characterized in that it competitively inhibits interaction of the native protein from which it is derived with a PP2a holoenzyme or one of its subunits" or "apoptosis of tumor cells" are not expressly taught, however, the peptides above meet the structural limitations required by the claims and therefore such binding activity would be inherent to the peptides of Arunagiri et al. which encompass Vpr fragments having 30 aminoacids or less in size. Furthermore, "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. [...]Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. [...]There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. (See MPEP 2112). With respect to the art rejection above, please note that the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether Applicants' binding activity to type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits, competitive inhibition or apoptotic properties with tumor cells (within the claimed composition) differ and, if so, to what extent, from that of the discussed reference. Therefore, with the showing of the reference, the burden of establishing non-anticipation by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Therefore the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Double Patenting

12. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

13. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 17-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 73-87, 91- 95 of copending Application No. 10/059,261. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications are drawn to peptides which are fragments of Vpr and comprise less than 30 amino acids in length. The peptides are known to have apoptotic activity as set forth in the claims of US '261 (e.g., claims 101-102) and include HFRIGCRHSRIG (SEQ ID NO: 225 of US '261, HFKIGCKHSKIG (SEQ ID NO: 226 of US '261), HFRIGCRHSRIGIIQQRRTRNGASKS (SEQ ID NO: 227 of US '261) HFKIGCKHSKIGIIQQRRTRNGASKS (SEQ ID NO:228 of US '261) (e.g., see claim 85).

Please note that with respect to the limitations "characterized in that in vitro, it specifically binds a type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits" and the limitation "characterized in that it competitively inhibits interaction of the native protein from which it is derived with a PP2a holoenzyme or one of its subunits" are not expressly taught, however, the peptides above meet the structural limitations required by the claims and therefore such binding activity would be inherent to the peptide of US '261. which encompass a Vpr fragment having 30 aminoacids or less in size. Furthermore, "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. [...]Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. [...]There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. (See MPEP 2112). With respect to the art rejection above, please note that the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in order to determine whether Applicants' binding activity to type 2A protein phosphatase holoenzyme or one of its subunits or competitive inhibition interaction of the native protein form derived from PP2A holoenzyme (within the claimed composition) differ and, if so, to what extent, from that of the discussed reference. Therefore, with the showing of the reference, the burden of establishing non-anticipation by objective evidence is shifted to the Applicants.

Therefore the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. (Please note that it appears that this application is in process of being allowed since there is a notice of allowance which was mailed out on 2/9/2010).

Conclusion

14. No claim is allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCELA M. CORDERO GARCIA whose telephone number is (571)272-2939. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia J. Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marcela M Cordero Garcia/
Examiner, Art Unit 1654

MMCG 03/2010